

### **Remarks**

The Applicants acknowledge the examination of Claims 1 – 6 and objection to Claims 7 – 16. For the record, the Applicants note that an Amendment was submitted in the International phase that cancelled Claim 1 and made numerous amendments to others of the claims. For the sake of clarity of the record, the Applicants have cancelled all of the claims in this Amendment and added a new set of claims as numbered 17 – 31. As a general matter, Claims 17 – 31 roughly correspond to original Claims 2 – 16, respectively.

The Applicants acknowledge the rejection of Claim 1 – 3 and 5 – 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102 over US '300. Those rejections are, of course, moot. However, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is also inapplicable to the new claims for the following reasons. Claim 19 is substantially the same as Claim 4, which was not previously rejected. Independent Claim 17 recites that the polyphenylene sulfide resin (b) is present in an amount of 20 to 45% by volume. This is sharply contrasted to US '300 that discloses the presence of polyarylene sulfide in an amount of 50 – 95% by volume. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 17 and claims depending therefrom are free of US '300.

The subject matter of Claim 20, which roughly corresponds to prior Claim 5, is also not disclosed, either directly or indirectly, by US '300. Although US '300 discloses that the polyarylene sulfide may be in a continuous or dispersed phase, there is utterly no teaching that the dispersed phase be a laminar dispersed phase, as recited in Claim 20. Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 20 and claims depending therefrom are free of US '300.

The rejections of Claims 1 and 4 – 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102 over JP '372 is now moot. The Applicants respectfully submit that JP '372 is also inapplicable to the claims corresponding to cancelled Claims 1 and 4 - 6. In that regard, the Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's

detailed comments concerning the hypothetical applicability of that disclosure, especially with respect to the statements that the relative amounts of the polyphenylene sulfide and polyamide fall within the range of the claims and, therefore, there is a reasonable basis to believe that the component (A) of JP '372 possesses the same morphologies as the Applicants'.

The Applicants respectfully submit that this is speculative, and is no way substantiated based on the reference itself. There are a wide variety of factors that control the formation of phase structures beyond the blending ratio. For example, the melt viscosity ratio is an important factor. This, among other things, is no way accounted for by JP '372. Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would have no reasonable expectation to assume that the morphologies would be the same. In that regard, the Applicants note that a rejection that is essentially based on inherency, which is the essence of this rejection, must demonstrate that the inherent characteristics necessarily flow from the disclosure of the reference. In this case, it does not. There is a potential overlap in blending ratios. However, as noted above, there are a number of other factors, including the melt viscosity ratio, that may have a large impact on the phase formation. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the disclosure of JP '372 does not meet the requirement that the inherent characteristics necessarily flow from the disclosure. It is mere speculation and, therefore, does not rise to the appropriate level to substantiate the rejection under §102. The Applicants therefore respectfully submit that JP '372 is inapplicable to the claims corresponding to cancelled Claims 1 and 4 – 6.

The rejection of Claims 1 and 4 – 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102 over JP '090 is moot. The Applicants respectfully submit that JP '090 does not apply to the new claims corresponding to cancelled Claims 1 and 4 – 6. In other words, irrespective of the fact that there may be some overlap in blending ratios, one of ordinary skill in the art would not necessarily conclude that the physical

characteristics would necessarily be present. It would merely be speculation that the claimed morphology would necessarily be present in the blends of JP '090.

The Applicants acknowledge the rejection of Claims 1 – 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102 over JP '425. Again, that rejection is now moot. However, the Applicants respectfully submit that JP '425 is inapplicable to all of the solicited claims for the reasons set forth above with respect to JP '372 and JP '090. JP '425 nowhere mentions morphologies and is merely speculative that the claimed morphologies would be present in view of the many factors that can and do influence such morphology formation. There is nothing in JP '425 that would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to believe that the claimed morphologies would necessarily be present in the structures disclosed by JP '425.

The Applicants acknowledge the rejection of Claims 1 and 4 – 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102 over JP '452. The Applicants note that this rejection is now moot. However, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is inapplicable to the claims corresponding to cancelled Claims 1 and 4 – 6 for the reasons set forth above with respect to JP '372 and JP '090.

Finally, the Applicants acknowledge the rejection of Claims 1 – 3 and 5 – 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102 over JP '556. That rejection is now moot with respect to those claims. However, the Applicants respectfully submit that JP '556 is inapplicable to the new claims corresponding to cancelled Claims 1 – 3 and 5 – 6. JP '556 discloses a polyamide and polyphenylene sulfide in a resin composition in such a way that causes phase separation. However, JP '556 is utterly silent as to what the phase structure is. It would be mere speculation as to what the phase structure would be. There is nothing in JP '556 that would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to conclude that the claimed phase structures would necessarily be present in those JP '556 structures. Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that JP '556 is not applicable to the claims corresponding to cancelled Claims

1 – 3 and 5 – 6.

In light of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that the entire Application is now in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



T. Daniel Christenbury  
Reg. No. 31,750  
Attorney for Applicants

TDC:lh  
(215) 656-3381